



# United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office  
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605  
Sacramento, California 95825-1846

IN REPLY REFER TO:  
HC-COE

August 29, 2000

District Engineer  
Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District  
ATTN: Nina Bicknese  
1325 J Street  
Sacramento, California 95814-2922

Subject: CESAC - Guadalupe River Flood Control Project, Lower Reaches  
(Downtown Project)

Dear Ms. Bicknese:

We have completed our review of the Draft General Re-Evaluation Report/Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Modification to the Guadalupe River Project, Downtown San Jose, California. Our specific comments (identified by chapter-page number/paragraph number) are as follows:

## Volume I

S-3/2: should read "...remnant steelhead trout <i>and salmon</i> ..."	USFWS-1
S-4/2: should read "...plans that were evaluated <i>in the current study</i> ..."	USFWS-2
S-19/postproject temperature: the "LS" should probably read "S" for significant.	USFWS-3
S-22/shaded stream surface: should read "...85% of bank <i>length</i> ..."	USFWS-4
1-15/last paragraph: Please check the remark that USFWS conducted endangered species surveys; these may have been done by another party. Also indicate which species.	USFWS-5
1-27/5: should read "...evaluation species <i>models</i> and one cover type <i>model</i> ..."	USFWS-6
replace "...species represented by the evaluation species...." with "steelhead and salmon"	USFWS-7
1-28/1: first line should read "...cover type <i>and belted kingfisher</i> ..."	USFWS-8
2-15/1 (after bullets): should read "...near I-280..."	USFWS-9

3-28: The figure appears to be inaccurate; it does not show the deletion of the path element on the right (east) bank downstream of Woz Way, or the pedestrian bridge across the river in the vicinity of the library.	USFWS-10
4-39/4: Delete the last two sentences, as the reference to extirpation of the red-legged frog below dams clearly does not apply to this watershed, and is refuted by discussion of post-dam confirmed records of this species later in the document.	USFWS-11
5-1/1: The entire first paragraph appears to be out of place and should be deleted.	USFWS-12
5-15/6: Either reference the data showing the position of natural armoring near the invert elevation, or delete the conjecture that such natural armoring causes overestimate bias in the erosion results.	USFWS-13
5-16/4: To our knowledge, the upstream end of segment 2 is not a pool; perhaps it is meant the “upstream portion” of this segment, or a segment below the bypass outlets. Please verify the location of the pool in question.	USFWS-14
5-17/1: Here, and in numerous other locations throughout the document, there is reference made to lack of effect on “long-term channel-forming processes”, for which the context of those processes is flows less than 1,500 cfs. These are not likely to be the flows which form channels; they are likely to form from much larger flows, flows which are diverted into the bypasses. Perhaps what is being confused here is the lack of effect of the project on channel maintenance processes; i.e., those flows which remove fines from gravels. Or, perhaps what is meant is that the bankful stage flow is not being diverted. Either of these flows may be less than 1,500 cfs. Or, the Corps has reason to contend that flows 1,500 cfs or less form channels in this system. Explanation and definition at first mention is needed, and perhaps some other term besides “channel-forming”. Finally, channel-forming processes are not always environmentally desirable when they cause excessive incision.	USFWS-15
5-29/2: The determination should say that the effect is significant but mitigated to less than significance, as the temperature increases in certain sections (as explained in volume 2) are permanent, not temporary.	USFWS-16
5-37/4: Should read “210 lf”.	USFWS-17
5-66/2: Again, the determination should refer to the fact that SRA instream and vegetative shade element impacts are being mitigated.	USFWS-18
6-27/2: Please state the background level of mercury so that the offsite disposal threshold can be better understood.	USFWS-19
6-32/5: The text and following table account only large civil works projects, however, as noted there are other smaller projects not listed. Please provide a best estimate of the total impact of these projects (i.e., bank hardening not associated with those listed in Table 6.2-2).	USFWS-20
6-47/4: Omit “...that can....”.	USFWS-21

6-49/4: Please respond as to why you selected one standard deviation above the median. A median is a non-parametric statistic and a standard deviation is a parametric statistic. Medians do not have standard deviations.	USFWS-22
--	----------

## Volume II

1C-2/4: Regarding "...slight increase in temperature in April due to the...project...", make clear that this applies to the post-mitigation condition for comparison, not the post-project, condition.	USFWS-23
--	----------

1C-9/1: In the last sentence, replace "other months" with "June".	USFWS-24
---	----------

1C-11/2: Sixth sentence should read "....the <i>upper</i> suboptimal range...".	USFWS-25
---	----------

1-3 (mitigation and monitoring plan)/1: Third sentence should read "Development of this final MMP..."	USFWS-26
---	----------

2-11/3: The third sentence pertaining to evaluating the weir as a permanent structure may be in error. The structure was built under a 404 permit condition as a temporary structure; please review the permit and modify or quote the permit language verbatim.	USFWS-27
--	----------

2-18/4: The last sentence erroneously implies that mitigation for contract 3c, phase 1, has been completed because of Reach A mitigation already done. This is not so. The mitigation for this phase has never been separated in this fashion from the overall impacts of contracts 1,2, 3a, and 3b because the thermal impacts are cumulative and not additive. The mitigation already done for Reach A was of a limited, test variety, which was not intended to mitigate impacts of a particular phase. Please delete this sentence.	USFWS-28
---	----------

2-19/4 (and other similar sentences throughout document, e.g., 2-36/2): It is not necessary to define thalweg as it is included in the glossary of Volume I.	USFWS-29
--	----------

2-29/6: Replace "sheer" with "shear".	USFWS-30
---------------------------------------	----------

2-32/2: We do not recall this particular version of the planting scheme or determination of the restricted zone, although it may have resulted from additional hydraulic analysis not included in this document. The concepts accompanying the initial hydraulic re-analysis in 1997 assumed excluding vegetation from the first 600 feet downstream of I-880, with the remainder having a trees and a restricted understory. This plan has a 300 feet exclusion zone, a 3,346 foot restricted zone with no understory, and a 4,502 foot unrestricted zone. Although it is not necessary to explain the rationale for these decisions in this document, a citation to the document which does explain them should be referenced.	USFWS-31
--	----------

2-34/4: Please summarize the "other structures" so as not to infer that temporary shade is a necessary first option.	USFWS-32
--	----------

2-39/Figure 2-9: Please revise the last timeline for Guadalupe Creek.	USFWS-33
---	----------

33-2/1: Add a bullet symbol.	USFWS-34
------------------------------	----------

Table 4-2/duration of monitoring: A number of the variables are a consequence of vegetation development and/or streambed adjustment during rare events (instream cover, channel bottom stability, spawning gravel abundance, rearing habitat diversity), unlikely to be measured after the 10 year duration.	USFWS-35
4-17/1: The reference to carrying capacity should be deleted because it is not relevant to survival criteria, which apply to the first 3 years only.	USFWS-36
4-31/1: Add wording "...cages <i>or</i> stakes...".	USFWS-37
4-31/5: Add wording "The <i>calculated thermal and cover</i> benefits...".	USFWS-38
4-32/4: Delete phrase "...however, planting might be phased in response to availability of seed material for collection and propagation, and could occur over multiple years". Although we understand that such an event might occur, it is neither planned nor desirable. Rather, our agency has encouraged that efforts be made, such as through identifying primary and alternative seed source areas, that would minimize such delays. The context of including failure and/or delay in the mitigation and monitoring plan implies a level of acceptability on the part of the resource agencies which has not been negotiated.	USFWS-39
4-38/3: Should begin: "At Target Year 40, trees and shrubs must shade at least 41%,..."	USFWS-40
4-45/3: Replace reference "U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2000c" with section 4.4.3.2 of this document.	USFWS-41
4-57/2: Delete the second sentence ("Temporary shade is a potential action..."). Rephrase third sentence to read "...would be implemented if required by the NMFS to meet conditions of its biological opinion...", and move the portion of the paragraph from the beginning of this sentence to the end of the paragraph, to follow the third paragraph. After excluding the initial word "Other", the existing third paragraph should then be included as part of the second paragraph, to read: "...Adaptive Management Team will determine the appropriate remedial action. Potential remedial actions that may be considered...include...".	USFWS-42

If you have any questions on these comments, please contact Steve Schoenberg of my staff at (916) 414-6564.

Sincerely,

Dale A. Pierce  
Acting Field Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: ARD, Portland, OR

CDFG, Director, Sacramento, CA  
NMFS, Santa Rosa, CA (Attn: Mark Helsby)  
RWQCB, Oakland, CA  
SWRCB, Sacramento, CA